

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois – CM/ECF NextGen 1.7.1.1  
Eastern Division**

Lemuel Washington

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: 1:21-cv-00556

Honorable Jeremy C. Daniel

Enterprise Holdings, L.L.C.

Defendant.

---

**NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY**

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Tuesday, September 3, 2024:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable Jeremy C. Daniel: The defendant has filed a bill of costs totaling \$8,362.02 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1). (R. [145].) The plaintiff has objected to that bill of costs as "inflated and unreasonable." (R. [152].) The plaintiff objects to \$2,107 spent on service of process, but the defendants provided invoices supporting the costs of service. Therefore, this objection is overruled. The plaintiff further objects that the defendant served subpoenas on hospitals that did not treat the plaintiff. But the defendant provided correspondence showing that the parties it served with subpoenas were parties identified by the plaintiff. Therefore, this objection is overruled. The plaintiff further objects to costs related to deposition transcripts and recordings. The plaintiff's objections to costs related to deposition transcripts is overruled. It does not matter that the defendant obtained transcripts of witnesses it produced; the transcripts were necessary to prepare for and file dispositive motions. As for recordings, the defendant obtained a video recording of the plaintiff's deposition at the cost of \$1,320. While courts have allowed parties to recover costs for both transcripts and video recordings of depositions, the defendant has not articulated a basis to find ordering both reasonable or necessary in this case. While the Court understands that a party may want videotaped deposition testimony for a witness who may not be available at trial, there was no reason to believe that the plaintiff would not be available at trial. And while a recording may prove more effective with respect to trial presentation, the defendant have not set forth any specific justification for ordering both. Therefore, the Court sustains the plaintiff's objection in the amount of \$1,320, which is the amount paid for the video recording of the plaintiff's deposition. Accordingly, the bill of costs is approved for \$7,040.02. Mailed notice. (vcf, )

**ATTENTION:** This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please

refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at ***[www.ilnd.uscourts.gov](http://www.ilnd.uscourts.gov)***.